

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/676,475	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RAJOTTE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Marjorie A. Moran	<b>Art Unit</b> 1631	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marjorie A. Moran. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Astrid Spain. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 11 June 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 5-7 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: ARAP.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner informed the attorney that the subject matter of claim 7 appeared to be allowable, but that generic claims 5 and 6 did not appear to be fully enabled. The examiner stated that the art taught "GFE" peptides which did NOT home to lung. Ms. Spain was asked if applicants wished to amend claim 5 to recite the structure/sequences of claim 7 and cancel all other claims in order to put the claims in condition for allowance. Ms. Spain said she would have to contact applicants; the examiner requested a reply by 6/13/03. No reply was received.